DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 940 EA 026 969

TITLE	National Initiatives: State & Local Strategies. Forum Proceedings (Atlanta, Georgia, February 9, 1995).
INSTITUTION	Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, CA.; Southeastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE), Tallahassee, FL.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	9 Feb 95
NOTE	26p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Performance; State Action; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*National Education Goals 1990; *United States (Southeast)

ABSTRACT

SERVE, the Southeastern Regional Vision for Education, is a coalition of educators, business leaders, governors, and policymakers seeking comprehensive and lasting educational improvement in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. This document contains the proceedings of a forum on the status of federal initiatives and the status of national-standards development, and explores ways that SERVE could better assist the development and improvement of education-reform activities. The meeting was structured around three themes--a perspective from Washington, D.C. on national education initiatives and resources; current statewide reform strategies in the six SERVE states; and the status of national content standards development. The use of technology was discussed as an avenue for changing the delivery system. A conclusion was that one of the most difficult tasks will be linking reform efforts, policy, and practice. Appendices contain a list of participants and information on the status of systemic educational planning in the SERVE states. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED 385 940

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

National Initiatives: State & Local Strategies

Forum Proceedings

Atlanta, Georgia
February 9, 1995

◆ Proceedings from the 1995 forum where the SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE) with support from the Center for Civic Education shared information on the status of federal initiatives and national standards development to discover better ways to assist constituent states, districts, and schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 026 969

National Initiatives: State & Local Strategies

Forum Proceedings

Atlanta, Georgia
February 9, 1995

This document was produced with funds from the Center for Civic Education with support from SERVE, the SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education.

The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsements by the U.S. Government.

Designed by: Kelly Killman Dryden

Table of Contents

About the SERVE Laboratory v

Agenda 1

Introduction 3

Washington Update 5

State Systemic Education Initiatives 7

National Content Standards 9

Forum Summary 15

Appendices

Appendix A 17
List of Participants

Appendix B 21
State Systemic Education Planning: Status in SERVE States

About the SERVE Laboratory

SERVE, the SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, is a coalition of educators, business leaders, governors, and policymakers seeking comprehensive and lasting improvement in education in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. The name of the laboratory reflects a commitment to creating a shared vision of the future of education in the Southeast.

The mission of SERVE is to promote and support the continuous improvement of educational opportunities for all learners in the Southeast. Laboratory goals are to address critical issues in the region, work as a catalyst for positive change, serve as a broker of exemplary research and practice, and become an invaluable source of information for individuals working to promote systemic educational improvement.

Collaboration and networking are at the heart of SERVE's mission; the laboratory's structure is itself a model of collaboration. The laboratory has six offices to better serve the needs of state and local education stakeholders. The contract management and research and development office is located at the School of Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The laboratory's information office is located in Tallahassee, Florida. SERVE's on-line computerized information system is located in Atlanta, Georgia.

Field service offices are located in Atlanta, Greensboro, Columbia, South Carolina, Tallahassee, and on the campus of Delta State University in Cleveland, Mississippi. The addresses and phone numbers of these offices are listed below:

SERVE - Alabama
50 North Ripley Street
Gordon Persons Building
Montgomery, AL 36130
(334) 242-9758; (334) 242-9708 FAX

SERVE - Florida
345 South Magnolia Drive
Suite D-23
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Lab
(904) 671-6000; (800) 352-6001; (904) 671-6020FAX
DISC Information Services
(800) 352-3747
Mathematics and Science Consortium
(904) 671-6033; (800) 854-0476; (904) 671-6010FAX

SERVE - Georgia
41 Marietta Street, NW
Suite 1000
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 577-7737; (800) 659-3204;(404) 577-7812FAX
(800) 487-7605 SERVE-Line

SERVE - Mississippi
Delta State University
Ewing Building Room 373
Sunflower Road
P.O. Box 3183
Cleveland, MS 38733
(601) 846-4384; (800) 326-4548; (601) 846-4402FAX

SERVE - North Carolina
201 Ferguson Building
UNCG Campus
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro, NC 27435
(910) 334-3211; (800) 755-3277; (910) 334-3268FAX

SERVE - South Carolina
1429 Senate Street
1008 Rutledge Building
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 734-4110; (803) 734-3389 FAX

Agenda

National Initiatives: State and Local Strategies Forum

February 9, 1995

Welcome
Washington Update
State Systemic Education Discussion (Small Group)
Content Standards (Breakout Sessions)
How Can SERVE Assist with State and Local Initiatives
Synthesis of Information
Reactions/Comments/Closure

Introduction

In recent years the country has experienced a surge of education reform initiatives, plans, and strategies at the federal, state, and local levels. Concerns that students are not learning the skills they must have to be successful in our changing social, economic, and personal worlds have given rise to serious debate about how to fundamentally change the education system and the environment in which it operates.

New governance, management, and organizational structures; new kinds of schools that reflect student, parent, and community values; classroom and school practices encompassing a variety of instructional strategies, technology, interdisciplinary teaching, and new assessments; and legislation to make schools safe are debated regularly in Congress, in state legislatures, and at local school board meetings. Ongoing discussions are taking place at every level as to exactly what students should know and be able to do—what standards and skills are important. Discussion participants want to know how state policymakers, local educators, parents, and community members integrate the various reform initiatives, research, resources, and opportunities to ensure that learners are successful students and productive citizens.

It was with these challenges in mind that the SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE), with support from the Center for Civic Education, sponsored a one-day regional forum on February 9, 1995, in Atlanta, Georgia, to learn about and share information on the status of federal initiatives, the status of national standards development, and to discover ways that SERVE could better assist constituent states, districts, and schools in developing and implementing education reform activities.

Participants from the six SERVE states were represented by local, state, and university education communities, as well as the business sector and representatives from six content standards-setting groups.

The meeting was structured around three themes: a perspective from Washington on national education initiatives and resources, current state reform strategies in the six SERVE states, and the status of national content standards development. Participants were able to learn more about the impact and potential of federal initiatives on states and the changing role of federal government in education reform. They also were able to share information about new and ongoing issues and the state strategies being considered to address them. The standards discussion enabled participants to learn more about the process national groups are using to develop and implement content standards.

Roy Forbes, Executive Director of SERVE, opened the forum and briefly described some of the products and services available to educators and policymakers, and suggested ideas for future SERVE action. Of note were the expansion of a policy presence in all six states and expansion of a variety of regional institutes studying and researching topics such as safe schools, technology, professional development, and evaluation.

Dr. Forbes concluded his remarks by challenging participants to use the forum as an opportunity to share cross-state experiences and to look at the federal role and funding opportunities as a way to leverage state and local activities.

Washington Update

Deborah Williams, Education Program Specialist, and SERVE liaison with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Washington, DC, opened this discussion by describing some changes taking place in Washington with respect to education reform.

Ms. Williams said that the 103rd Congress passed many education bills that could potentially restructure local, state, and federal educational policies. Citing highlights of the 103rd session, she said that for the first time, under the Goals 2000 Educate America Act, national education goals have been codified into law. Reform legislation structures a framework for the first-ever national standards in several discipline areas. She further stated that reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), among other things, allows for new Chapter I requirements built around standards; it expands professional development opportunities for teachers, and permits seed money for school technology plans. She also identified the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, that encourages schools and teachers to mix classroom activities with on-the-job training and said that, as part of an omnibus anticrime bill, Congress authorized over 800 million dollars over six years to help schools with stopping youth violence and drop-outs. She predicted that many of the old debates from the previous Congress, including school choice and school prayer would probably be reopened, and that the effect of recisions on the FY 1995-96 education appropriations remained to be seen.

Ms. Williams also indicated that the U.S. Department of Education is taking first steps to "reinvent" itself. "Department officials believe communication is a key focus. USDOE personnel must be better able to respond to constituents and are attempting to realign departments in order to provide quick and useful access to information," she said.

Ms. Williams concluded her remarks by citing critical areas where she believed the federal government is playing a key role to enhance and support state and local reform efforts including:

- Promoting parent and community involvement
- Integrating technology into improvement areas to train teachers to be computer literate and to ensure that no student fails to receive necessary and advanced curricula due to geographical location or lack of resources
- Providing drug-free schools where teachers can teach and students can learn
- Allowing flexibility in regulations

She emphasized that the ultimate objective for everyone, regardless of occupation, position, or party affiliation must be, "... a world class education for all our children. In order to provide that world class education," she said, "we must return to a community spirit, hold high expectations, and be concrete about what students should know and be able to do."

We must return to a community spirit, hold high expectations, and be concrete about what students should know and be able to do.
-Deborah Williams, USDOE

Summary of Questions/ Concerns, and Responses

- Is there local support for Goals 2000? Will the resources available help schools and states reach their individual goals?

Most forum participants believed that many people support the objectives of Goals 2000 at the local level. Ms. Williams suggested that, given the financial picture in some locations, those who are struggling to find ways to pay for education improvements are perhaps more supportive of the Goals 2000 legislation and accompanying funds. Perhaps more important to many is that the legislation allows local entities to chart their own way, unencumbered by the usual regulatory oversight that accompanies federal dollars. Regarding available resources, Ms. Williams pointed out that funding was available for both planning and implementation of Goals 2000 strategies.

- How can the U.S. Department of Education help states move from the "fragmented" pieces of education reform to a more "coherent system"—the big picture? How does the Department plan to connect Goals 2000, ESEA, and other programs?

  OERI may be realigned into regional desks whereby a team will concentrate upon and have knowledge about all federal initiatives and become more responsive to regional constituents. Also, several pieces of legislation, including Goals 2000, Improving America's Schools Act, and the School-to-Work Transition Opportunities Act are related and build on of each other.

- Where is the money for technology? How do states access the funds?

  Dollars for technology were available for FY '95, though now with the most recent recisions sought by the Congress, technology has suffered. As of this writing, the House has voted to terminate some 46 programs and reduce several others. Those slated for termination (at the time of the forums) included Star Schools, the National Diffusion Network, Ready to Learn TV, and the Eisenhower Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Math and Science Technology.

Session Conclusion

Concluding the first forum session was Judy Harwood, U.S. Department of Education, Region IV. She announced that a regional forum on school reform issues is planned for March 29-31, 1995, in Columbus, Georgia. The first day, she said, she will focus on principals and teachers: a principals' forum on leadership qualities and a forum with teachers who are leaders in reform efforts. During the two days, sessions will be held, she said, on school reform, Goals 2000, and other federal initiatives including school to work, adult education, and exemplary programs and practices in the Southeast. The target audience will be state education officials, local educators and leaders, business representatives, and parents.

State Systemic Education Initiatives

The second forum session, State Systemic Education Initiatives, was designed to learn more about the status of education reform in each state. Using a matrix compiled by the Council of Chief State School Officers (see appendix B), state teams were asked to review and update information in eleven reform areas for their state. During the state conversations it became clear that there are many entrees into school reform for these states. The most common were: developing curriculum frameworks and standards, professional development activities, and developing statewide visions for education. Politics and resources not withstanding, all six states are attempting movement in some or all of these areas.

Summary of Questions/Concerns, and Responses

- How can the momentum of reform be sustained through state-level leadership transitions and turnover?

  Participants agreed that this is a major concern when there are significant shifts in vision and focus regarding education at the state level. A recent publication by SERVE, "Overcoming Barriers to School Reform in the Southeast," reported an analysis of the top six education positions in the SERVE states and found that only two of 36 positions remained constant since the reform movement began in 1983 and that the average position had changed leadership three times since then. This revolving door leadership at the top level, accompanied by funding issues and lack of trust among legislators and educators, contributes to slowing the momentum for reform. One answer according to the study is that all players in the reform movement must come to agreement on answers to two seemingly simple questions: What should our students know and be able to do, and how do we assess that?

- How do we gain support for education reform from opposition and different interest groups? How do we narrow the gap between advocates of reform and those who question the need for change?

  Educators who propose substantive change in schools must engage and inform the public. At the same time, they also have an obligation to assist schools in working with special interest groups. Without public understanding, support, and participation, efforts at reform are destined for failure. Reformers need the support of the community to succeed. Some participants' suggestions were: hosting meetings for a cross-section of the community, inviting those expressing concerns with reform efforts to discuss "all sides of the story," ensuring that schools reflect what the community wants, opening schools to the public, making the public feel welcome, being clear about the desired changes, and determining how they will make things better for students.

- How can we ensure that the statewide vision for education reform is known and owned by policymakers, educators, and citizens? How do local educators accomplish the mission?

  Again, we must be sincere in our efforts to ensure that all players with a stake in education reform must be included in all areas and at all levels. To achieve meaningful change, there must be agreement on vision, goals, and methodologies. In each community, decisions must be made as to what students should know and be able to do, and how that is assessed.

- How are different states connecting Goals 2000 to state and local efforts? Are existing local curriculum frameworks being realigned with state and federal guidelines?

  Virtually all states are engaged in the development of state education improvement plans. Many of these plans have been modified or revised and have been or are being submitted to the U.S. Department of Education as state plans for the planning phase of Goals 2000 grants. SERVE staff commented that recent surveys of states have shown that at least 46 states are developing some kind of curriculum frameworks.

National Content Standards

At the National Education Summit in 1989, a National Education Goals Panel was formed by the fifty governors following their establishment of the first-ever national education goals. After subsequent recommendations that it was desirable and feasible to develop national education standards, no less than thirteen different groups embarked on the difficult road to developing national standards in various discipline areas. The standards efforts over the past three years have been organized with continuing input from thousands of teachers, citizens, education organizations and others holding varying points of view. Now, many of the projects are completed or near completion.

The third session of the forum convened a six-member panel to discuss the process and issues related to developing national content and performance standards. The panel members representing the six discipline areas were: Bill Strong (geography), Chair and Professor, Department of Geography, University of North Alabama; Gwen Hutcheson (social studies), Consultant for Georgia Council for Economic Education, Georgia Humanities Council and Southern Center for International Studies; Mac Arthur Goodwin (arts), Education Associate, South Carolina Department of Education; Dorothy Augustine-Howard (language arts), 7th grade teacher, Kittredge Magnet School for High Achievers, Atlanta, Georgia; Erma Anderson (science), National Science Teachers Association; and Mary Lindquist (mathematics), past President of National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Below are some of the main points presented by each panel member.

The standards document will be a political document conceived to meet real and perceived needs of business, higher education, and community life.
-Dr. Bill Strong, University of North Alabama

Geography

Dr. Bill Strong stated that, "The standards document will be a political document conceived to meet real and perceived needs of business, higher education, and community life." In explaining the standards, he focused on the vision statement in the completed geography standards, *Geography for Life*, as the developers' hope of how the standards would be used and viewed, that is, geography as the study of people, places and environments and the spatial relationships among them. He said, "Geographically informed persons understand and appreciate the mosaic of the interdependent worlds in which they live. While a knowledge of geography is enjoyable in itself, it has practical value through the application of spatial and environmental perspectives to life situations from a local to a global scale."

The document contains eighteen standards in three categories that address: (1) knowledge statements about what students should know, (2) activity statements about what students should be able to do, and (3) learning opportunities and illustrations of how a teacher might convert an activity into a learning opportunity. Essential elements provide a framework for the standards. They are: seeing the world in spatial terms; places and regions; physical systems; environments and society; and application of geography. The content of each standard delineates subject matter

The World in Spatial Terms

Geography studies the relationships between people, places, and environments by mapping information about them into a spatial context.

The geographically informed person knows and understands:

- How to use maps and other geographic representations, tools, and technologies to acquire, process, and report information from a spatial perspective.
- How to use mental maps to organize information about people, places, and environments in a spatial context
- How to analyze the spatial organization of people, places, and environments on Earth's surface.

knowledge, skills, and perspectives (personal, environmental, disciplinary, historical, and economic).

Social Studies

Gwen Hutcheson, a Consultant with the Georgia Council for Economic Education, Georgia Humanities Council and the Southern Center for International Studies, told participants that the document, *Social Studies Curriculum Standards* was published by the National Council of Social Studies (NCSS) in the fall, 1994. Basically it consists of ten theme-based content standards, accompanied by student performance expectations for grades K-4, 5-8, and 9-12. She said the standards were developed to bring all social science disciplines into the field of social studies in order to produce a functioning citizen in an interdisciplinary global society. NCSS hopes to track the implementation of the standards through analysis of mailings and follow-up correspondence with those who have received the standards document. There will also be workshops on the standards at national, state and district professional meetings. One of the most important aspects in the further development of the standards will be the attempt by NCSS to work with standards developers in the other social science disciplines to integrate the standards of all these disciplines, many of which overlap or duplicate each other. This interdisciplinary approach to social studies will almost certainly require a rethinking of preservice and inservice training for those planning to teach social studies.

She emphasized that educators, policymakers, and the public must understand that the illustrations and vignettes accompanying the standards are guidelines, and are not a mandated curriculum or teaching methods.

The Arts

Mac Arthur Goodwin of the South Carolina Department of Education told participants that the National Standards for the Arts are statements of what every American student should know and able to do in four arts disciplines: dance, music, theatre, and visual arts. Their scope is K-12 and focus on both content and achievement. He emphasized that the standards, which were among the first to be completed, in March 1994, will need supporters and allies to improve how arts education is organized and delivered. He said that the country must realize we will need more qualified and better trained teachers, and that school-based teams, school boards, state education agencies and local and state arts groups and mentors will also play a role critical to the success of the standards.

Goodwin pointed out that, "The standards provide a vision of competence and educational effectiveness without creating a one-size-fits-all mold into which all arts programs must fit." He said standards are concerned with results, not with how those results are achieved. He concluded by saying that knowing and practicing the arts is fundamental to the development

of the whole person's education. "As stated in the standards document," he said, "that is why the arts are inseparable from the very meaning of education."

Language Arts

Dorothy Augustine-Howard, a teacher working as a reviewer for the Language Arts standards project, said that the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English were working collaboratively to develop content standards for reading and language arts. The standards will articulate what is most important and valued in teaching and learning language arts, will be predicated on a strong theoretical and empirical base and will result from a national consensus building process. She said that underlying these efforts is a strong commitment to develop standards for all students, regardless of home language, ethnicity or economic status.

"A major assumption of the project is that language is the most powerful tool there is for representing the world to ourselves, and ourselves to the world," she said. Those working on the project believe that language is not only a means of communication, but also, "...an instrument of thought, a defining feature of culture, and a mark of personal identity." Developers are working from a constructivist theory of learning that assumes learning occurs when students interact with materials that are different, difficult, and cause learners to ask questions. Standards are being developed to emphasize diversity, culture, and language that reflect the reality of students and their environments. The draft standards currently under review, which will be accompanied by vignettes illustrating issues and problems and examples of teaching activities, are expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Science

Erma Anderson, of the National Science Teachers Association, reviewed the progress in the development of national standards for science. She explained that the national effort is being directed by the National Committee on Science Education Standards and Assessment, under the auspices of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. The Committee is coordinating the development of standards for science teaching, content, assessment, programs, and policy. The standards will apply to grades K-12 in all the above areas. Standards are being

Students should be able to:

- communicate at a basic level in all four disciplines.
- demonstrate and communicate proficiency in one art form.
- understand and analyze basic works of art.
- demonstrate acquaintance with exemplary works of art.
- relate art knowledge and skills across the arts disciplines.

Standards provide a vision of competence and educational effectiveness without creating a one size fits all mold into which all arts programs must fit.
-Mac Arthur Goodwin,
South Carolina Department of Education

Standards Statement:

Students show growth and increasing sophistication in writing for a variety of purposes and audiences and in a variety of genres.

In grades K-4, the study of mathematics should include opportunities to make connections so that students can:

- link conceptual and procedural knowledge.
- relate various representations of concepts or procedures to one another.
- recognize relationships among different topics in mathematics.
- use mathematics in other curriculum areas.

The overarching goal of the mathematics standards is to create a new vision for teaching and learning mathematics—to change what happens in the classroom and to use math concepts to make real-life connections.
-Dr. Mary Lindquist, Columbus College

designed so that students in grades K-4 will be introduced to science, in grades 5-8 become more involved in theory, and in grades 9-12 introduced to the more concrete science disciplines and complex ideas.

Ms. Anderson commented that "discussion summaries" are now available to the public, in K-4, 5-8, and 9-12 areas, with sections dealing with life, physical, earth, space, and technology sciences. Implementation plans for science standards will include science teachers working through national, state, and local initiatives. Currently a nationwide dialogue is being developed, with working papers being shared on the draft version of the standards released in the fall of 1994. She commented that standards implementation also includes plans for professional development using national science teacher organizations. Final versions of the standards are due out in 1995, with review during the spring and completion by December 1995.

Mathematics

Dr. Mary Lindquist, past President of National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), presented an overview of the development of the well-known NCTM math standards. She pointed out that these standards actually preceded the current standards movement and that the math standards were completed in 1989. Since then, NCTM has continued to establish a broad framework to guide reform of mathematics into the next century. NCTM has completed work on two sets of standards, Curriculum and Evaluation Standards, and Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics. A third, Assessment Standards for School Mathematics, is to be released in the spring of 1995. NCTM is monitoring the implementation of the math standards through the use of case studies in schools around the country, and through the use of workshops at the state and national levels. Complimentary copies of the two completed sets are available free to NCTM members.

Dr. Lindquist stated that, "The overarching goal of the mathematics standards is to create a new vision for teaching and learning mathematics – to change what happens in the classroom and to use math concepts to make real-life connections." She believes a key challenge is to ensure that students are exposed to math concepts as they move through the grades – to lay a foundation in the early grades that will enable more students to excel in advanced math courses in secondary grades. She also stated that the two sets of com-

pleted standards are beginning to have some influence on textbook publishers.

Summary of Questions/Concerns, and Responses

- What does the sheer, overwhelming number of all the standards mean when they are added up? What does that mean for the student and for teachers? Will kids be able to achieve so many? What is the best way to make it manageable?

  Participants noted that there are currently efforts by various organizations to review and synthesize the standards. As an example, the Mid-continent Research Education Laboratory (McREL), has produced a document that attempts to cross-reference all content standards.

- What new strategies of teacher training across disciplines will be necessary in order to carry out the philosophy and intent of the standards?

  From the comments of the majority of the presenters, all participants in each of the standards projects are aware of and are considering the professional development necessary if the standards are to be adopted and used.

- How soon will textbook publishers begin to recognize the standards and reflect the changes in books and instructional materials?

  According to Dr. Lindquist, the standards and their influence are already having some effect on textbook publishers.

Forum Summary

Summarizing the forum, Dr. Nicholas Hobar, President, Workforce 2000, Inc., provided a perspective on how to think about the work ahead: put high standards in place, design a coherent framework that supports high achievement for all children, and create supporting delivery systems. He asked participants to think about three questions. Why do all of this? How do we make the pieces fit? And, how do local educators accomplish the mission?

Why do all of this?

Dr. Hobar pointed out that the current standards movement sets 21st century learning expectations for all students. Schools and states are looking forward and comparing current student performance with the 21st century learning expectations. The gap between current performance and the expectations defines the extent of school reform—or what must be done to meet and exceed the standards. He said this is a major shift from the past when educators typically looked backward and compared current student performance with normed groups of students who performed on standardized norm-referenced tests.

How do we make the pieces fit?

"Vision gives reform direction," said Dr. Hobar. "Too often reforms are fragmented—a piece here, a piece there. Looking forward to the 21st century offers an opportunity to think about and develop plans for changing the system. New definitions of the 'system' are emerging that reflect new goals of higher student achievement levels and more emphasis on students' ability to solve real world problems."

"Given the current emphasis on content standards," Dr. Hobar said, "the challenge will be to identify and carry out the methods most likely to help all students achieve and excel. To accomplish the levels of learning described in the standards, educators and policy makers must develop a vision that is clear and concrete—much like President Kennedy's vision of sending a man to the moon and returning him safely. That was a vision all citizens could understand. Moreover, there was a clear vision for developing the delivery system to accomplish the mission."

A clear vision for achieving the new standards will assist all stakeholders to rally around a central thrust and to coordinate resources for the good of all students. The process of defining the vision in terms of learner expectations promotes the notion that all stakeholders can focus on a common purpose and can optimize what they do for the good of the system.

How do local educators accomplish the mission?

Dr. Hobar noted that in school reform efforts across the nation, policymakers are attempting to make clear their visions of results desired from standards and reforms in teaching and learning. All say they have no wish to dictate methodologies by which results will be obtained. That, they say, should be left up to professional educators. Ironically, the emphasis on results assumes that districts, schools, and teachers know the methods to use to achieve high standards. "However," Dr. Hobar said, "if teachers already knew the methods for achieving the high standards, then students would be achieving at higher levels." He pointed out more needs to be done to provide new, cutting-edge knowledge about the methodologies to achieve high standards. Professional educators need to be supported in benchmarking teaching processes that have an outstanding track record and can be applied in their classrooms.

Using technology as an example of one way the delivery system might change, Dr. Hobar commented that the application of technology could be a powerful tool for students and teachers. A delivery system that is augmented by technology could enhance and provide lesson plans, help coordinate content standards with teaching strategies, and identify exemplary teaching strategies. However, all this would depend on a certain amount of autonomy for teachers and schools. Dr. Hobar said that states and districts will more than likely need to relinquish a certain amount of program control for teachers to take full advantage of the available technology.

Concluding his remarks, Dr. Hobar offered an interesting scenario: a "virtual reality classroom." He suggested that, "...much as pilots train and learn to solve problems associated with flying by using a simulator, perhaps the idea of a classroom simulator is not far behind. Teachers could try new ideas, experience the reality of the classroom and students, receive feedback and assess different delivery systems and applications."

A virtual reality classroom may be a stretch for some. However, as Roy Forbes expressed at the beginning of the forum, "We need to rethink and push our thinking about what is possible."

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Clearly, as evidenced by the foregoing discussions, there are few readily available, packaged answers to the questions raised by forum participants. One of the most difficult tasks will be how to link reform efforts, policy and practice. Participants concluded the one-day meeting with optimism reflecting on questions they viewed as important for future discussions, particularly for those at state and local levels:

- What are some promising strategies to blend national content standards, existing curriculum frameworks, Goals 2000 and other reforms into a coherent statewide system? Whose responsibility is it?

- Can content standards, new forms of student assessment, and changes in service delivery be implemented on a wide scale without accompanying changes in policy? What policies will likely be affected?

- What is the role of higher education? What kinds of collaborations are needed between higher education and public schools to better prepare students for college or work? What is the role of higher education in standards setting and teacher education?

Appendix A

List of Participants

February 9, 1995

Erma M. Anderson
Project Manager
Teacher Center NSTA
National Science Teachers Association
1840 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington VA 22201
Phone: 703-312-9256
Fax: 703-522-1698

Sherman L. Anderson
Vice Chairman
School District 5
1604 Hollingshed Road
Irmo SC 29063
Phone: 803-731-1930
Fax: 803-731-2745

Dorothy Augustine-Howard
National Council Teachers of English
1729 Clubgreen Overlook
Stone Mountain GA 30088
Phone: 404-808-0258

Anita Buckley-Commander
Policy Analyst
SERVE
1005 Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia SC 29201
Phone: 803-734-4110
Fax: 803-734-3389

Martha Chaney
Suite 800
120 N. Congress
Jackson, MS 39201
Phone: 601-353-5488
Fax: 601-353-5486

Deborah Childs-Bowen
Field Services Manager
SERVE
Suite 1000
41 Marietta Street N.W.
Atlanta GA 30303
Phone: 404-577-7737
Fax: 404-577-7812

Carolyn T. Cobb
Director
Division of Development & Evaluation Services
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh NC 27601-2825
Phone: 919-715-1351
Fax: 919-715-1204

Brian Curry
Policy Analyst
SERVE
345 S. Magnolia Drive, Suite D-23
Tallahassee FL 32301
Phone: 904-671-6000
Fax: 904-671-6020

Van Dougherty
2131 N. Meridian Road #141
Tallahassee FL 32303
Phone: 904-385-0760

Paula Egelson
Research & Policy Analyst
SERVE
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro NC 27435
Phone: 910-334-3211
Fax: 910-334-3268

Roy Forbes
Executive Director
SERVE
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro NC 27435
Phone: 910-334-3211
Fax: 910-334-3268

Charles Ray Fulton
Director
Leadership Development
Duval County Schools
1701 Prudential Drive
Jacksonville FL 32207
Phone: 904-390-2217
Fax: 904-390-2237

Mac A. Goodwin
Education Associate
South Carolina Department of Education
801-E Rutledge Building
Columbia SC 29201
Phone: 803-734-4382

Judy Harwood
Deputy Secretary's Regional Representative
US Department of Education
101 Marietta Tower Building
Atlanta GA 30301
Phone: 404-331-2502
Fax: 404-331-5382

Nicholas Hobar
Workforce 2000, Inc.
309 Wickersham Way
Cockeysville MD 21030
Phone: 410-666-5701
Fax: Same as Above

Marla D. Holbrook
Policy Analyst
SERVE
50 N. Ripley Street, Room 5106
Montgomery AL 36104
Phone: 334-242-9758
Fax: 334-242-9708

Gwen Hutcheson
Educational Consultant
260 Burnett Street
Athens GA 30605
Phone: 706-548-2926

Faegin Johnson
State of Alabama
Department of Education
50 N. Ripley Street
Gordon Persons Building
Montgomery AL 36130-2101
Phone: 334-242-9716

Mike Jones
Athens Middle School
P.O. Box 144
Elkmont AL 35620
Phone: 205-233-6620
Fax: 205-233-5906

John Kelley
Assistant Superintendent
Elementary Education
School District of Oconee
P.O. Box 649
Walhalla SC 29691
Phone: 803-638-4064
Fax: 803-638-4031

Mary M. Lindquist
Callaway Professor
Columbus College
14 Seventh Street
Columbus GA 31901
Phone: 706-568-2255
Fax: 706-323-6531

Joyce Long
SERVE
Suite 1000
41 Marietta Street, N.W.
Atlanta GA 30303
Phone: 404-577-7737
Fax: 404-577-7812

Glenn Newsome
Executive Assistant for Education Policy
245 State Capitol
Atlanta, GA 30334
Phone: 404-651-7792

Cathy S. Pittman
1995 Georgia Teacher of the Year
103 Marsh Landing Drive
Brunswick GA 31525
Phone: 912-267-4200

Pamela P. Pritchett
Special Assistant
South Carolina State Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia SC 29201
Phone: 803-734-8277
Fax: 803-734-6214

Emma White Rembert
Chairperson of Education
Bethune Cookman College
640 M.M. Bethune Blvd.
Daytona Beach FL 32114
Phone: 904-255-1401

William (Bill) R. Strong
Professor/Chair
Department of Geography
University of North Alabama
Box 5064
Florence AL 35632-0001
Phone: 205-760-4218
Fax: 205-760-4663

Myrtis Tabb
Educational Program Specialist
SERVE
P.O. Box 3183
Cleveland MS 38733
Phone: 601-846-4384
Fax: 601-846-4402

Suzanne Ulmer
Director
Office of Innovative Support
Mississippi Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson MS 39205-0771
Phone: 601-359-2561
Fax: 601-359-2040

Tom Upchurch
President
Georgia Partnership for Excellence
233 Peachtree Street, Suite 200
Atlanta GA 30303
Phone: 404-223-2280

Judy S. White
Development Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh NC 27601-2825
Phone: 919-715-1359
Fax: 919-715-1204

Deborah A. Williams
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington DC 20208
Phone: 202-219-2204
Fax: 202-219-2016

Appendix B

State Systemic Education Planning:

February 1995

	Alabama	Florida
Content Standards Under Development		
Content Standards Ready for Implementation	Math, Science, Health, English, Social Studies, Foreign Language, Music, Visual Arts, Physical Education, School-to-Work	
Student Performance Standard		
Student Assessments	NRT, CRT, WS	NRT, CRT, WS
Opportunity to Learn Standard	X	
Teacher Policy on Professional Preparation	X	X
State Technical Plan	X	X
Government & Management Change	X	X
SEA Reorganization	X	X
Bottom Up Community Involvement	X	X
Collaboration/Integration of Services	X	X

LEGEND:
X = Policy, Program, or Strategy for Component in place at present
• • • = No Survey Data at Present

INFORMATION PROVIDED FROM:
State Systemic Education Planning–Status in Your State, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC, 1993.

Status in SERVE States

Georgia	Mississippi	North Carolina	South Carolina
Being reviewed: Math, Science, Health, Language Arts, Social Studies, Foreign Language, Arts, Physical Education, Computer Science	• • •	Being reviewed: Science, Foreign Language, Arts	Health & Safety, Science, Health, English, Language Arts, Social Studies, and Physical Education
School-to-Work	• • •	Math, Health, English, Social Studies, Physical Education, Computer Science, School-to-Work, Citizenship, Multiculturalism	Math, Foreign Language, Visual & Performing Arts
Being reviewed: Math, Science, Health, English, Social Studies	• • •		Being reviewed: Math, English, Language Arts
NRT, CRT, Pr, WS	NRT, CRT, WS	NRT	NRT, CRT, Pr, WS
	• • •		
X	• • •	X	X
	• • •	X	X
X	• • •	X	X
X	• • •	X	X
X	• • •	X	X
X	• • •	X	X

ASSESSMENT CODES:
NRT = Norm-Referenced Test
Pr = Performance Test
WS = Writing Skills
CRT = Criterion Referenced Test